



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
097690,284	10/17/00	JOHNSON	R F-147

MM92/1004  
PAUL A LEVITSKY PITNEY BOWES INC  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND TECHNOLOGY LAW  
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE  
P O BOX 3000  
SHELTON CT 06484

EXAMINER
LEE, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2876	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/690,284

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON ET AL.

Examiner

Seung H Lee

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US 6,244,763) in view of Hayashi et al (US 5,829,985).

Miller teaches the method for printing an indicia on a label in a system including reading a label configuration file (10, 40, 60) (see Fig. 1 - 3, and 5), selecting an amount of labels to be printed, printing the amount of labels (94) in accordance with the definition file such that the a label pair comprising a destination address (96) and a corresponding indicia is printed wherein the corresponding indicia comprises a destination barcode (94), the destination barcode is two dimensional barcode corresponding to the United States Postal Service (USPS) Indicia-Based Information Program (IBIP) (see Fig. 5; col. 1, lines 18 - 33; col. 7, lines 5 - 10),

However, Miller fails to teach or fairly suggest that the selecting a label stock, reading a definition file associated with the selected label stock, and tagging the label pair with a unique identifying mark (i.e., watermark) in a predetermined inconspicuous area of the label.

Art Unit: 2876

Hayashi teaches tagging and tagging the label pair with a unique identifying mark such as a watermark (85) in a predetermined inconspicuous area of the label (see Fig. 6; col. 7, lines 32 - 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the identifying mark such as watermark as taught by Hayashi to the teachings of the Miller due to the fact that the such security mechanism would prevent an unauthorized personnel from utilizing the label, that is, the "VOID" will be shown on the copied label if unauthorized personnel makes an illegal copy of the indicia. Although, Miller as modified by Hayashi fails to particularly teach the label configuration file is indicative of one or more label stocks and selecting a label stock for printing indicia on the label, the system of Miller/Hayashi obviously includes a software/template to choose/select appropriate label layout among various layouts (Fig. 1 to 3) for proper printout of the label indicia to further accommodate the size of the box or the size of the item to be placed thereupon (i.e., the system would not print-out a label which is twice as big as the item/box to attach the label thereon, etc).

3. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller as modified by Hayashi et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sansone et al (US 5,925,864).

The teachings of Miller/Hayashi have been discussed above.

Although, Miller/Hayashi teach the method for printing indicia on a label, Miller/Hayashi fails to specifically teach or fairly suggest that the printing of the

Art Unit: 2876

destination barcode comprises printing an encryption of the destination address and a unique identifying mark is an alphanumeric character.

However, Sansone teaches the encryption module for printing a destination barcode, and the identifying mark or tracking code (7) (see Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 1 - 65)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Sansone to the teachings of Miller/Hayashi in order to provide an improved security means by encrypting of the destination barcode for preventing an authorized personnel from knowing the destination address. Moreover, such modification (i.e., alphanumeric character as a coding identifier) would provide easier means for tracking the mail since the mail is scanned into the system at every major transaction center using unique tracking code or identification number. Furthermore, such modification (i.e., alphanumeric character as a coding identifier) would provide an alternative method of reading the identification of the mail due to the fact that when the reading machine is not working properly, the alphanumeric coding identifier or tracking code would provide proper identification of mail, and therefore an obvious expedient.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller as modified by Hayashi et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sansone (US 6,188,996).

The teachings of Miller/Hayashi have been discussed above.

Although, Miller/Hayashi teach the method for printing indicia on a label, Miller/Hayashi fails to specifically teach or fairly suggest that the tagging the label pair includes color-coding with different color.

However, Sansone teach the color printing of the indicia (25) (see Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 31 - 57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the color printing of indicia as taught by Sansone to the method of printing indicia on the label as taught by Miller/Hayashi in order to have a better recognition/verification of the identifying mark under a different light conditions (i.e., dark and/or bright lighting conditions). Furthermore, such modification (i.e., printing indicia in color) would have been an obvious design variation, failing to provide any unexpected results, well within the ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller as modified by Hayashi et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Block (US 6,010,156).

The teachings of Miller/Hayashi have been discussed above.

Although, Miller/Hayashi teach the method for printing indicia on a label, Miller/Hayashi fails to specifically teach or fairly suggest that the coding identifier is tick hashing line.

Art Unit: 2876

However, Block teaches the hash lines for using as an identification mark (321) (see Fig. 3A; col. 5, lines 6 - 21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Block to the teachings of Miller/Hayashi in order to provide easier sorting means for sorting mail piece based on the value/number of hash lines, that is, hash lines can be determined to delivery location (i.e., payment department, customer service department, product inquiry department) automatically using a OCR reader and/or sorting personnel, and therefore an obvious expedient.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure;

Sansone et al [US 6,142,380], Sansone et al [US 5,292,008], Berson [US 5,929,415], Dolan et al [US 5,806,421], Fabel [US 6,209,920] disclose a postal indicia and printing the same.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Seung H. Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308-5894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2876


If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee, can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax-phone number for this group is (703) 308-5841 or (703) 308-7722.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.lee@uspto.gov].

*All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.*

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

*SHL*  
Seung H. Lee  
Art Unit 2876  
26 September, 2001

  
MICHAEL G. LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800